CEUNET)

D)

1 April 1955

Ch/0/A

Ch/D/E

Comments on Tentative Outline of Intelligence Feview of Foonomic Defense Problems.

- nerits most careful and thoughtful treatment as it must serve and the basis for a workeble seconomic defense policy. Any determination of what commodities should be controlled or what level of control should be exercised of necessity must be regliatic, and insofar as it serves as the basis for international controls, acceptable to COCCM countries.
- enst to the Flor of a curtailment of Flor imports, as well as various definitions of this "cost"; through the use of ruble-deliar ratios as indicators of relative costs of production as described in section by F would be as interesting and meritorious asserties. It would be, however, a time consuming, occupicated process, fraught with the dangers inherent in the lack of adequate, reliable statistical data. From D/M's long experience with tortuous CCCCM negatiations, it appears inconceivable that such a method would be accepted by CCCCM countries as the basis for security trade controls, even if it were approved by USS policy makers, which appears unlikely.
- 3. The present outline is illogical and contradictory in several places.
 - a. In I), it is stated that the real problem is "that consedities should be denied," whereas IVE indicates that "the paper will not result in a list of commedities, or commedity categories." It would thus seem that the whole paper as cutling would throw very little light on the main problem involved.
 - b. IIA states that the present COCKE program does not greatly reduce over-all volume of trade," but III3 reads "the present program limits total trade but III3 reads "the present program limits total trade and, therefore, imposes a cost on the Plos economy which can be thought of as an impairment of Bloc economic capabilities."

ocope1-3

SECONET

-2-

e.III(1) points out the almost inemperable difficulties involved in measuring the cost of denying the Bloc various imported goods, whereas in paragraph III(4) we read that, "conceptually, therefore, most logical approach would be that which selects conmodities for denial on the basis of maximizing overall most of control program to the Bloc. . . " If a concept is logical but impossible to use in practice, it would appear illogical to incorporate it as the basis for the proposed study.

- A. In paragraph III(), the statement is made that "In Yew, if any cases can denial be confidently assumed to have reduced the cutput of any particular military goods in the Seviet Elec." This is priently incorrect when account is taken of the denial of a whole galaxy of prototypes. It was impossible, for example, for the Floc to produce a certain type of radar until they were able to obtain a 55 prototype under lend-lease. The same applies to denial of western accountfic and technological advances. At least an element of delay is injected into 985% military production by embarge not only of prototypes but of centedities in short supply in the Floc.
- 5. The description of Present Policies is section II and the Evaluation of Present Programs III, are not entirely accurate and in any event require redrafting.
- 6. In section IV, Alternative Fessibilities in Trade Control Felicy, it is suggested that "overell value quotes for free world exports to such Floe sountry" be considered. The difficulties of administering the present system of a quote for the bloe as a whole suggested instituting western import controls against the floe is also suggested. The basis for the institution of import controls by the US against Communist Chine was the fact that we were at wer with that country. Home of the other COCCH countries, except Canada, went along with this US action even though some of them were sending men to fight in North Mores. They certainly would not be expected to secode to such controls against the whole Floe nor would the US business community.

In general, the whole outline needs revision and a more realistic approach to the problem.

1 April 1955

25X1A9a

SECRET